Previous references

File No. 52-02

1907-8

Serial Nos. 1—6

(Sep: Rev)

Later references.

B. aug 11. 881-8. S.R. 1670
B. June 13 sen 2 Do 214-12
S.R. 40-1341-2 B. 3.14
S.R. 74-1588 102, B. Jany 1916
S.R. 54-1688 102. B. Octr. 16.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—6

Part B. for June 1908

SUBJECT.

Inamdar's claim to the toddy Excise revenue of Udaboor Kayamgutta vil. Mysore Taluq.

---

1) From the Excise Commr No. 4571/23987 submits the record of enquiry relating to the Toddy revenue of Udaboor Kayamgutta village, Mysore Taluq and states that under the circumstances explained only ½ of the revenue is payable to the Kayamgutadar from 1892-3 to 1896-7

2) To the Excise Commr No. 5248 calls for certain papers and information regarding the existence or otherwise of a similar [illegible] as the following as allegedly

G.R. S. 58

From the Prin. [illegible] to Sri H. H. [illegible] Mysore

Forwards for disposal a petition from the Kaigangottadar of Yedabur praying for an early payment of the amount due to him from the date of introduction of Inam System

4) To the Excise Commr No. 428 of 26.11.03.

Invites attention to the above & calls for an early submission of the information desired to be supplied to Govt in sl (2)

5) From the Excise Commr No. 6242 of 31.5.04

Submits the records pertaining with the further information called for

6) To the Excise Commr;
The Comptroller;
Supt of Inam settlements
No. 2L 6461-3 of 11.6.08

Recognises with certain limitations the Inamdar's claim to the toddy, Excise revenue of Yedabur Kaigangotta Village Mysore Taluk.

G.R.S. 11] 1907

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(S. R)

NOTES.

File No. 52 of 190

FILE HEADING.

Claim to the toddy revenue of Udaboor Kenjanguttha village Mysore taluk

From

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

No. 4571/239 Dated 7·2·03 Received 14·2·03

Diary No. 8873	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submits the record of enquiry relating to the Toddy revenue of Udaboor Kayamgutta village, Mysore Taluk and states that under circumstances explained only 1/5 of the rent of the grove farm is payable to the Kayamguttadar from the year 1892-93 to 1896-97.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

2 To the Excise Commissioner

No: 544 of 20 4 03

Observes that in his petitions the inamdar states that there exists a grove as well as a shop in the village

NOTES—First sheet.

GPB—30,000—20-3-06.

Serial No.

while he admits in his Statement the non existence of a grove, directs that it should be ascertained whether a grove really exists or not & the fact reported to Govt & requests that Copies of the Sannad & the inam Settlement record & the muchalikas referred to in the finding of Mr. B.K. Venkatavaradaiengar may be Subd to Govt together with a Copy of the Beriz account for the year in which the village was alienated.

3 From the Private Secy to His Highness the Maharaja
No: 1405 dated 4.11.03
Transfers for disposal petition from Nanjappa son of Basavarajiah, Kaymugutadar of ~~the~~ Udaboor praying for orders to pay the amount due to him from the date of introduction of amani system.

4 To the Excise Commissioner
No: 428 & 26.11.03
Invites attention to the above petition addressed by the inamdar to His Highness the Maharaja and requests that the record connected with the claim may be Subd at an early date

GPB—50,000—25-2-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

SM File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

with the said information called for

5 from the Excise Commr
No 4342. 931.5.07
submits the record of enquiry with further information called for states that there is a doubt & a grove & recommends in modification of his first recommendation that the Remandar is entitled to the toddy revenue of the village.

In his letters nos ~~4571-2399 9/4/97~~ ~~and 4571-35~~ 5259-379.97 19/4/97 and 4571-2399 7/2/03. the Ex Commr reported that the Rayaru Gutteda was not entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy. The only additional document that was since produced & that was by the present owner of the village Mr V. Raghavachar Advocate Mysore is Hutteveli Sthavara Chittu for 1827 28 The reasons assigned by the Excise Comr in support of his present view that the Remandar is entitled to the Excise revenue from

Note
This is unauthenticated & relates to 3 years prior to the year of the grant of the village. It is not clear why this was not produced in the first instance
[illegible]

GPB—30,000—25-2-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 190 2

Serial No.

lodhi were:—

1. That the Nirmal of 1/2/1830 alienating the village has not reserved any right to Gond,

2. That the kabiz of the village continued lodhi ~~also~~ even both before & after the village was alienated and that the item should have been therefore included in the kabiz for the year 1830 (year of alienation) also. The Kuttumali chittas of 1827-8 and 1845 are referred and the total kabiz is said to be the same in all these

3. That the inamdar has produced documentary proof of enjoyment from 1888 to 1890-91 & that the presumption of enjoyment during the previous years may be justified by the recorded entries in the original chitta of 1845 read with the chitta of 1827-28 & the Nirmal of 1830;

and 4. That the adverse finding of the Inam Settlement has not

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

uncorrected such an opinion

Point 1.) So far as the ~~land~~ revenue is concerned the right can be recognised only if it has been expressly conceded in the Sanad or Inam, ~~or at least it has been a~~ ~~recognised~~. This is the principle that guided the Inam Settlement. & the Inam Settlement in this case has rightly restored the revenue in question to Goud (vide para 2 of Gov. No 3697-Rev-30 dt 8/10/1873 & para 6 of the Precis of Inam orders). The Revise Commr has completely ignored the above facts in this case, & his finding is incorrect

Point 2) This may be true, but the Revise Commr does not seem to have paid ~~his~~ attention to para 5 of the Deccan Inam Commr's remarks of 13/10/79 to the effect that a reduction of Rs 58-2-9 has been

Note—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

made in 1855 (ten years later than the Chitta relied on by the Excise Commr.) the Sattidaar does not pay the amount as per Sanad. The Sattim amount payable according to the Sanad is Rs 1358-14-6 but only Rs 1189-7-1 is being paid ~~from~~ evidently from 1855. The Excise Commr has not taken the trouble to find out why the deduction was made in 1855. The Chittas Commr therefore be taken as sufficient authority to recognise the claim in the absence of the details of deductions made in 1855.

Paras 3 & 4 This will be useful only to give the case a special treatment under rule 20. Even then some add'l information ~~is necessary~~ is necessary. Such as was not the Inam settlement communicated to the Salt authorities & the Inamdar & if it was

Gen. 2074-83. 27/8/02
Ex 166-92

W

GPB—50,000—25-2-07

R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

how was its further enjoyment by the Inamdar allowed and how can the concession be extended to the present holder of the village who is only an alienee and whether the limitation laid down in para 6 of the Inam Rules has not to be applied to this case

Submitted for orders. If approved the Inam Rules may be consulted.

Sd/ 20/6/07

Please put up file containing G.O. No 332-4 Ex 12-07 & G.O. 2-03 mly 28/7/7

17. Submitted

Hay W

The file containing the order referred to is obtained & put up ~~[illegible]~~

Sd/ 19.7.07

In the absence of express mention of the Concession in the Sanad and in the face of the express reservation at the Inam Settlement the right of the Inamdar ~~can not be regarded as has~~ to loss revenue

GPB—50,000—25-2-07

8 8

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S R File No. 52 of 1902-03

Serial No.

Can not be regarded as established
The enjoyment of the revenue by him
was under the circumstances un-
authorised and the case is for the
special orders of Govt under para
2 of G.O. of 2-8-01 and para
3 of the Chief Commrs proc of
8/10/73

mch
19-7-7

General Secy

Has any search been made in
the Secty Vernacular records for the
beriz patti of 1830 & other accounts
throwing light on the subject. In
another similar case of an inam
village belonging to Sri Bakshi Barappaji
Urs found such accounts were
available

23/7

From No 19

To the Vernacular records
Please look to the Beriz patti
of the year in question & say if
"Shendi" is included in the beriz

23/7/07

Rec P. 14-55 P.M.
23/7/07

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

S.R File No. 82 of 1902-3

Serial No:

ಕಂದಾಯ ಶಾಖೆಯವರು- ಚೆರೀಚೆರಂ ವಾಸ್ತ್ರ ಪ್ರಥಮತೆ 1798-1799 ನೆ ಸಾಲಯುಕ್ತ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯ ವಾದ ಆದಮಬೂರಾಲು ಗಾರುವರ್ಷಮಾಂಇಂಗುಚೆ ಕೈಕೊಂಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿ ಸಂವತ್ಸರಮಾಂಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರಾಸ್ಸಿ ಕಾರುವಾರ್ತೆ ಸಲಿಅದಸಕ 1830 ನೆ ಇನಿಯಮಾಂ ಕಟ್ಟಿಪ್ರಿಯ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಸಕ/ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂತಿರಾಂಲು ಕೈಕೊಂಡು ನಾಂಬೂರ ಅರವತ್ತೈಳುವರಹಾಂಬಿಂದುಮಾಂಹಾರ್ಕೆ, ಸಾವಿರಸದಿಕರಲು (T) ಗುರ್ತುಕ್ಕಾದ್ದುಕ್ಕಲು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರ್ಕ್ಕ ಮಾಂಇಂಗುತ್ತಾ ಕಾಂತಿಗೆ ಯಮಾಂ ವಿಚಾರಂದಬಾಂಬಲ್ಲ- ನಾಂಬಾಕ್ಕ ಸದಿಂದಾಗ ಶಿಕ್ಷಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಂತೆ ಕಂದಾಯಶಾಖೆಯವರ್ಕ್ಕ ಇವಾಂಕಾಂತಿಗೆ ಇತರ ವಿಚಾರಂದ ಬಾರ್ಕ್ಕಳ್ಳಾಂಬಿಗೆ ಗಂಬಿಯುನ್ನಾಂಬಾಂಗಿದ್ದಾರ್ಕ್ಕ ಅಂಕಾವಿಯಲುಯರ್ಕ್ಕ ಕಂತಿರಾಂಲು ಕಾಂಗಿ ನಮಾಂಬಿ ಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯರ್ಕ್ಕ ಇತರ ಅದೆರಸದಿಕ್ಕಳ್ಳ ದೈವ್ವಾಂತೆಕಾಂಗಿ ಕಾಲಿಯುಲ್ಲಪ್ಪುಟ್ಟುವೆ- ಆದುದಲಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾಂಬಿಲ್ಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಂಇಂಗುತ್ತಾದಾರ್ಕ್ಕಗೆ ಪ್ರಶಂಸೆಯುಲ್ಲನಶಕ್ತಂಬಿಮಾಯುಶಕ್ತಿಯುಯದಿಲ್ಲಾಕಂದು ಹೇಳುಪ್ರಯತ್ನ. ವರಾಕಿಪ್ಪುಲಾಕಿಂಕಾರ್ಕ್ಕಿಂದಗಳ್ಳ ಕೇಳ್ಕೆಯಿಂದ ವಿವರಿಸಿಯುವಲರ್ಕ್ಕಳ್ಳುಸಾಂಕ್ಷಿಕಾಂಗಿಯುಂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಾಂಗಿಯುಂ ಇಪ್ಪುತ್ತಿವೆ ——

Flag 1 — 3
Flag 4 — 6

ಸಕ 1829-30 ನೆ ವಿಲಂಬಿನಾಮ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಂಇನ್ನಿಯುಮತ್ತು 1830-31 ನೆ ವಿಕೃತಿಸಂವತ್ಸರ ಚಾರುಂಇನ್ನಿತ್ತಿಂಗಳ್ಳಿಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಮಬೂರಾಲು ಗಾರುಲರ್ಕ್ಕೆ "ಶೇಂಬಿಕ್ಕುಲ್ಲುವಳಿ" ಎಂಬ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿಂಗಿ ಕೇಳ್ಕೆಕಾಂ "ಂ" ಸೂಂಕ್ಕೆಲಂಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಇಲ್ಲಾಂಕಾಂ ಬರಿಯುಲ್ಲಪ್ಪುಟ್ಟುವೆ — ಇಪ್ಪ ಗಾರುಮಾಂಇಂಗುತ್ತಿ

ಕೆಳ್ಳಿ

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

S.R File No. 52 of 1902-3

Serial No.

ಗೈಕೆಯಾಂಟ್ಸು, ಅತಿಯಾಂಲುಲುಯ ಡೆವೆಯಲು ಮಾಡಲೆತ್ತ ಗಳಾಂ ಗಿಲುತ್ತ ಮೆ-ಬಿಂದುಲೆಳ್ಳಿ ಸಲವಿ ಲ್ಲಿಂದ್ರ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಯ್ಯ ಈ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿವರಿಸಿದ (1-6) ವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳುಳ್ಳ ಚಮಾಂಶಗಳ್ಳಿತ್ತಿ ಗಳಿಗಾಂ ದಂಲುಶಿರಿಚಿದೆಲಾಗಿತು.

Flag 7 8

ಅತಿಯಾಂಲುದ 1831-1832ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿರ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದ ದೆಸೆಯಾಂಕ್ಷಿಲಿಟ್ಟಿ ಅಂದಳಿ ಗಿಯಾಂಕ್ಷು ಡೆಲುಳ್ಳಲುಂ ವಿಷ್ಣುಮಾಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ ಶೇಂಬಿಯಾಂಬಿ ವಿವರಿಸಿಯುದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೆಕ್ಕಿಚಿರಿಲ್ಲ ಇದಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಮಲುಂಬಾಗುತ್ತೆ. ಇದು ಬಿಂದುಲಿಂದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಮಲುಂಬಾಂದುಂಬಾಗಿಲುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸನ್ 1831-1832ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿರ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದವರಿಗಿನ ಪ್ರಸಲಾಂತಿಲುಳ್ಳ ಲುಸರಿಸಿ ಗಿಲುಳ್ಳ ಲ್ಲಿಂದ್ರ ——

Flag 9 10

ಸನ್ 1854-55ನೆ ಅಯಿದ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲುಂಬಾಂದಿತ್ತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ 61, 62ನೆ ಪುಟಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಸೇರಿಸಿಯುದು ಮೆಚ್ಚಲುಲುತ್ತೆ

"ಪ್ರೇಂಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಂಲುಂ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆಯಿದಪ್ಪೆಂ ಅದಮುಂಲು ಗಿಲುದಮಾಂಗಿಲು ಚಿಕ್ಕ ದ್ವಾವಣ್ಣಿ ದೆವರು ಬಂಲುಲುಂ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಯ ಮುಂಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷಯಲುಳ್ಳ ಮಾಂಚಿಸಿಲುಂ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಚೆಯ್ದಿನ್ನು ಸಾಂಚಿಗಾಳವರು 1850ನೆ ಇಸವಿ ಅಗಸ್ಟು 19ನೆ ಮುಕಮುಂಲಾಂ 349ನೆ ನೊಟಿಫಿಕೇಶಂ ಪ್ರಕಾರಂ ಪುನಃ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಂಚಿಲ್ಲ ಸಾಂಚಿಲುಂ ಬಾಂಬಾಯಿ ಕಂದಾಯಂಲುದಮುಂ ಭಲಾಲುಮುಂ ಪತ್ರಿವಿಷಯಲುಳ್ಳ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಮುಂದಿಗಾಂಚಿಲು ಕೊಂಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಮಂಬಾಂಚಿಲುಂ ಸಮಯಿಗಿಯದರ್ಪಿತೆಲುತಮಿಗೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಮಾಂಚಿಸಿಲುಂಗಾಂ ಗಿಲುಂ ಪ್ರಿಂಚಿಲುಂದೆಂಗಿದ್ದ ಪ್ರೈಮಂಚಿಸಿಲುಂಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಚೆಯ್

GPB—50,000—25.2.07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

S.R. File No. 52 of 1902-3

Serial No.

ಸ್ವಸ್ತಿ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರು ಕೆಲಮಿಕಿಯ ಗಾಂವಿಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಂಬ
ಇಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾಂಡಲ್ಕಟ್ಟುವರ್ತಮಾನವಿದಾ ಸಮತಿಮಾಂ
ಗಲುಗಳ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಗದಗಳು ಬಾಗಿಲಿಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ
ತ್ತಾಗಲು ಮತ್ತು ಬಾಗಿಲು ಮುರಿದು ಪೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಾಹೇಬರ
ವರುಗಳ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮುರಿದು ಬಹಳ ಸರಕಾರದಿಂದ ಸ
ರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಂಸಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು ಅನ್ನುವಂತಿಲಿರುವಾಗ
ತ್ತೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದರಂತೆ ಇದ ಬಾರಿಗಳಿದ ಬಾಂಗ್ಲಿ
ಗಳು ತಾಗಿ ಮಾಂಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದು

೩೬ ೧೧೪೮ = ಬಾಂಗಾಂಲುಗಳು ಕೆಂಪಾಂಲು —
ಗಾಂಬ್ಯುತೆಂಗಿ ಕಮರದ ಬಾಂಗಾರು —
೨೪ ೧೦ ೧೧ = ಅಡಿಕೆಮರ ಬಾಂಗಾರು —
ಗಾಂಬ್ರಿಂಕಿತ್ತ ತೆಬಾಂಗಾರು —
೧೧ ೦ ೧ ÷ ನಿಂಬೆಮರದ ಬಾಂಗಾರು —

೩೬ ೧೧ ೪ ೮ =
೨೧೬೩ = ಕೇರಿಗಲ ಬಾಂಗಾರು —
೨ ೦ ೧ ೪ ಪ್ಯುರ್ ಕೆಂಪಾಯ (ಸುದೆಗೆಂಪಾಯ)
೬ ೪ ೬ = ತೆಬಾಂಗುಬಾಂಗಾರು —

೨೧೬೩

ಶಿವ ೬ ೦ ೬ ÷

ಈ ಬಾಂಗಾರುಮಾಂಗಳುವಾಂಮಂಡಿಸಿದ
ರೆ ಸ್ವಸ್ತಿಶ್ರೀ ಸಂ ೧848–1849 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಜಿಲ
ರ ಸಂವತ್ಸರ ಶ್ರೀ ಗಾಂಲುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯ
ದವ ಸಾಂಲಾಗಿರುವರೆಗೆ ಮಾಂಗಳುಗಳಿಗೆ
ಬಾಂಗಿ ಮಾಂಪಸೆರಿಂಡಿಸತಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲಿಂಗಾ
ಗವಗೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಮಾಂಡಿಗಳುವಷ್ಟು 3/ ಕೆ ಮರಖಂ
ಒ ೨ ೭ ಕೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಲೆಕ್ಕರೆ ಸಾಂದರಿಗಾಗಿರುವ ಸಖ್ಯ
ಸಿ

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಮಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಖಾಯಿಂಗಳುತ್ತಿ, ಗಿ-
ಮಾಣಾಗುವೈರಿ ಅದರಿದ ಸಂವತ್ಸರಂ ನೈ —
ಶ್ಯರ್ತ್ಯ ಉ: ಖಾಯಂಗಿದಿಗೆ ವಚಾಮಾಡಬುಳ
ದು ಎಂಗಿ ಬಾಗಿ ಸ ೯ 1854 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂ
ಬರಿ 13 ನೇ ಮರಖಾಂ 395 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಕ್ರಮಾಂ
ದರಂದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಮ — ಶ್ಯರ್ತ್ಯ ಉ: —
ಇಂತಿ ಖಾಂ ——— "
× × × × ×

ಈ ಮೇಲಿನಿಂದ ಕಂಡಂತೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ನಿ
ರ್ಕಮ್ಮಿಲುಂದ 58 ವರಹಾಂಗಳಂ ಅಸ್ಥಿ
ವಿಸ್ತರಿಸಿ ಸ ೯ 1855-56 ನೇ ಕಾಂಪ್ಯ ಸನಂ ಮ್ಮಿ
ರದ ಖಾಯಂಗಾಂದಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀದಳ್ಳಿ ಕಾಲ್ಯ
ಮುಖಕ್ಕುಂಗಿ ಗೆ ಕಮ್ಮಿ 395 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಕ್ರಮಾಂ ಪ್ರ
ಕಾರ ಮೆಂಕುಂಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಲುತ್ತಾರೆ — ಈ
ಕಾರಣಂದಿಂದ ಅತಿಖಾಂಇಂಗುತ್ತಾ ಮಾಣಾಗುವಂ
ದಿರಾಲು ಕ್ರಿಸ್ತಿಗಳು ಇಷ್ಟಾಸ್ಥಾನಂ ಬಹುಮಿ
ರೈತ್ತಗಳು - ಕಮ್ಮಿಲುಂದ ಖಾರ್ಚ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಪ್ಪು
ಗುಮತೆಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀಂದಿಖಾಂಚಿದಲುಂಡ್ಯ ಇತ
ರ ಖಾಂಖುಂಗಳು ಸಹ ವಚಾಂ ಅಗಿ ವಸುಂತಿಮಿಂ
ಗಾಲಗಳ್ಳನಾಗಿ ಕ್ರಿಸ್ತಿಂದ ಖಾಂಚಿಸಿಲುವಿ
ಣಂದರಿಂದಲೂ, ಕ್ರೈತರಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರಿಕೆಲುಂತೆಂಕ್ಕ ವ
ಕಾಂಖುಂಗಳು ಕಮ್ಮಿಲುಂದ್ರಾಂದ ಶ್ಯರ್ತ್ಯ ಉ:
ಲುಂಗ್ಗಾಣ್ ಕಮ್ಮಿ ಎಂದುಳ್ಳ ಕ್ರೈತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀಲಿಸ್ಥಾ
ಗಳುತ್ತೆ ಯೆಂ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಕ ಖಾಂಲುಂಗುತ್ತಾ
ದಾ ಅಕ್ಕಳುಂತೆ ಶ್ರೀಂದಿಖಾಂಚಿಕ್ಕ
ಟ್ಟುವಳ್ಳಿ ಕಮ್ಮಿಗಳ್ಳತೆಂದಣಿಕೆಲುಂಗ್ಗಾಣ್ ಎಂ
ದು ಅರ್ಥಂ ಕಾಣುಂದಿಲ್ಲ. Flag-9-10
ದಲುಂಗಿಟ್ಟು ಕೀಲಿ - ಸರಂ ಕಾಲ್ಕೆ ಅದವ

Flag 11

ಕಿಗೆ

Note—Contn. sheet

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S.R. File No. 52 of 1902-3

Serial No.

[illegible]

26.7.07

Submitted for orders

[illegible]
27.7.07

Note continued as per personal directions with reference to the accounts of 1827-28 & 1829-30 and of 1844-45 available in our vernacular records.

Jamabandi accounts for Samvathsara (1827-28) not available in records. The Jamabandi accounts of the

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No.

years 1818 to 1826 do not show any revenue under tody in respect of this village. The accounts of 1828-29 show a revenue of 3 Varahas against the village in question but in the consolidated account for the whole taluk for the same year "tody revenue" is included in "Rajabab" and against this item of revenue no revenue is shown under this item against "Kuyque gutter villages" The entry of 3 Varahas against the village as stated above ~~[illegible]~~ that the omission in the consolidated accounts seems to mean that 3 Varahas ~~was~~ collected in the village during the year by Gouda (Pancha Bab amani [illegible]) and this is borne out by the entries in the accounts of 1844-45 relied upon by the Diwan

These accounts relate period to the grant of the village

The accounts of 1844-45 found

Note—Contn. sheet

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

in the ~~records~~ file are incomplete & not acceptable as paras 2, 3 & 4 ~~are~~ missing & para 5 is a copy of para 6

The accounts of 1844-45 received from the Dimsion Sheristadar & filed in our vernacular records contain no entry about Todur in respect of this village.

Filed
Date
6/8/07

This is in Mahalatti (Sd.) [illegible]

~~The Inamdar's contention that~~ From the note of the Vernacular Records Branch it appears that there is no evidence of the inclusion of the item of revenue in the lands alienated to the Inamdar, whose enjoyment of it, in the absence of express concession by the Sanad & express reservation at the Inam Settlement can only be regarded as unauthorised.

9-8-07

Case worker to kindly bring up to [illegible] 13/8

Agree Secy

Add the Excise commr's opinion u-o on the facts stated in note put up by the vernacular records

24/8

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

SM File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No. 26/8/07

No 7839 Forwarded to the Excise Commr for favour of opinion
Enc as per list
(2 ver files & other papers)

PSO
Mon Venkatrama Iyer
Asst Secy
24.8.07

Rem 4 pm
26/8/07

The canam records show that the deduction of 58 P. 27. 9 made in 1855 in no way includes eyem it being made up of Bagayat Managam Lingani Inam Babhatu, Adihi, Kitti Umbu Zinge Babhatu, Inani Managam & London Babhatu & was made because such summon was allowed to the ryots on these pattas & Govt had to make a corresponding summon to the Inamdar

I have no reason to doubt the genuineness of the Sulwar Chitta of 27-28 or that of the being patti of 1845 since the being in the above two Acts & the Lawnad of 1830 in the same & since the being included today revenue I am of opinion that the Inamdars can fall under Rule 20 of those published on 2/8/07 It is not absolutely very that the

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Sph File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

the Inamdar shall prove his enjoyment for every single year for the last fifty years, but only that he should prove his enjoyment at reasonable periods. In this case I am of opinion that the Inamdar has produced the necessary evidence

H H Sparks
14/9/07

Submitted for orders

The Revenue Comr is of opinion that the right has to be allowed under rule 20

In connection with the claim to the tody revenue of Dalasigere & 6 other villages in the Korkote Taluk. a general question has been raised as to whether in cases falling under rule 20 ~~[illegible]~~ right has to be allowed ~~only for~~ perpetuity or only for a limited period as laid down by the Chief

Sph 38-02 (5 6591)
Submitted to Gn on 21/9/07

Vide Ho 8

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

Vide Jul 1902

Comr in his Proc of Oct 1873 this file also may either be sent in continuation or await the issue of orders in the Dalasigere Case

Submitted to the Govt Secy
19.9.07

21/9/7

This may also be submitted to Govt

21/9

4488/23-9-07

I agree in the above conclusion. The Sannadi does not concede the Jodi Enam & the Inam Settlement actually reserves it to Govt. But there has been long continued enjoyment though unauthorized. The Jodi Enam Revenue may therefore be allowed in full to the present proprietor of the village and in one moiety to his successor in title. Thereafter it shall be resumed to Govt.

Please draft according for approval. In such important cases like this & the Dalasigere Cases

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

SRR File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

Cases it is advisable that the decision should have the Devaswom concurrence

[illegible]

Please put up draft and submit to Devaswom through 1st [illegible]

[illegible]
11/10

Draft-submitted
The present holder of the village is Mr Raghavan advocate who obtained full right over the village by purchase in a Civil Court sale held on 12/2/09 on the strength of which he has obtained a sale certificate from the Court on 7/6/09 then he may have been previously in possession of it under a mortgage deed. The rules were issued for the settlement of the rival claims on the 2nd August 1909 and

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

and the proviso under rule 20 thereof ~~must~~ ~~both~~ is supposed should be construed with the power contained in sec. 30 of the late Chief Commr's Gen. No 3697 of 8th Oct 1873 and Regn Rev. 30 in strictly applying the principle the "present holder" seems to mean the ~~holder~~ person who was the proprietor of the village at the time of the issue of the rules. In the present case therefore no Reg. transaction is to be considered as a succession in title to the person who was the registered proprietor in 1901 & consequently he will be entitled to only moiety of the revenue and with his life it will lapse to Govt.

This is approved to be correct the Govt requires alteration

~~[illegible]~~

GPB—50,000—25.2.07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

It is reported above (permissible that the claims were settled by the Inam Department subsequent to the Order of 1873

Have you got any authority or precedents

Draft submitted to Dewan the Commissioner

The above office note raises a very important question whether the present holder of the Inam who came into possession (full ownership) after the rules of 1901 were published should be confirmed as the present holder or his successor in title. I am inclined to think that the question of title to Zoddy revenue being now decided & Govt. the present holder is the holder whom the revenue is now confirmed and not the one who was in enjoyment when the rules of 1901 were published

I am also of this opinion

Attention is also invited to the Commissioner's opinion recorded in the Dalasigere case that in cases of long unauthorised enjoyment falling under Rule 20 one-half of the Rent may be confirmed in perpetuity — a rule suggested by Mr. Krishnaraos

This will impose a greater burden on the State

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S R File No. 52 of 1906

Serial No.

in that case
(Gul Hay)

18
12.11.07

4907
19.11.07

Dewan through 1st Cr

ABJ
9/11

The draft may be approved
2 I do not wish to comment for
or the statement that the Chief Ro
Rv of 1873 are still in force - The
principle underlying it is however equitable
& may be adopted when occasion
like the present requires - I have
slightly altered the draft in this
sense
22/11/07

18
25/11

7039
25/11/07 Dewan's ans

The draft order does not ~~in the~~ contain any
reference to the opinion expressed by the Sucise
Commr ~~that~~ in para 5 of his letter that the Sucise
revenue was taken into account ~~for~~ in determining the
Kayamgutta and does not as is done in the note controvert this position
The draft may be suitably revised

BJ. Ln
4/12/07

ABJ
4/12

16/12

NOTE—Contn. sheet

5259 06 28/12

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

SOR File No. 52 of 1902

Serial No.

A proposed draft order

Please keep a fair copy in the file and submit later

Dewan through 18th 10/12/7

5222 21.12.1907

4423 25/12/07

27 Dec 27/12

(draft approved)

Translation of the Govt order No. H. 6461-3 & 11.6.08. put up as instructed by the Undersecy on the slip above.

20 5.08

6 To The Excise Commr.
The Comptroller
The Supt of Inam Settlement
No H 6461-3 Dy 11/6/08

Observes that in consideration of long continued enjoyment of toddy revenue by the Rayamgutandars the toddy excise revenue will in accordance with the principle laid down by the late Chief Commr in his Rev. No. 3697 Rev 30 of 8th Oct. 1873 be allowed in full to the present proprietor by the village

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50 000—17-3-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No 52 of 190 2

Serial No.	
	and in one moiety to his successor in title after whom it shall lapse to Govt.

Contn sheet.

GPB—50,000—17-3-07

No 4571/39 Land 1 file

Excise Commissioners Office
Bangalore, dated 7th February 1903.
11

From

P N Purnaiya Esquire B.A.
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

H. V Nunjundiah Esquire M.A.L.L.
Secretary to Government
Genl & Rev: Departments.

Sir

In submitting herewith the record of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Udaboor Kayamguttha village, Mysore taluk, I have the honor to state that the investigating Officer is not correct in his finding that the Kayamguthadar is entitled to Excise Revenue from Toddy I have already in my letter No. 5259/379, dated 19th April 1897, given my opinion in the matter The sanad of the village does not concede the Abkari Revenue from Toddy. At the Inam settlement the Abkari Revenue has been reserved to the State. If the Kayamguthadar was not satisfied with the Inam settlement, he was at liberty to appeal to the Government against it He failed to do so The sanad of the village shows that it was granted as Kayamguttha in the year 1830; but the authenticated copy

of

Ex-246
14/2/03

(1)

8873 1903
14 FEB 1903

FROM
P. A. Purnaiya Esqr B.A
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To
H. V. Nanjundaya Esqr M.A
M.L
Secretary to Govt.
General & Revenue
Departments

Dated 7th February 1903.

Despatched " do

Received

General No. 45-71
No. 239
Enclosure No. 1 file

Submits with his opinion
the record of enquiry relating
to the Toddy Revenue of Ulsabou
Kayanguttha village, Mysore
taluk

Ex
14.2

Submd. with the ~~[illegible]~~ Dy Ct

True
14/4/03

of the Berry patti produced by the Kayam=guthadar, is from the year 1845. In those days, the money derived by leasing date trees to the Government Contractor, — might have been shown in the Berry account, as if from Toddy. Under such circumstances, only $\frac{1}{5}$th of the rent of the Grove farm is payable to him from the year 1892-93 to 1896-97 under Rule 4 in Government proceedings No. $\frac{2074-83}{R.F.166-92}$ dated 2nd August 1901

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
[signature]
For Excise Commissioner
in Cuddapah

Ex 243 dt 23/11/03

(3)

3

1903

Copy of No 1405/2 dt 4/11/03 transferring petn to the Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revi Dept for disposal

By order

Sd/ E. Macnoelue
Private Secretary

Reference

13-11-03

17/11

Transferred to the Excise Branch in continuation.

21/11

20-11-03

Excise Br.
Please note if Report has been rec'd in this case

21/11

Draft & ref. put up

25/11/03

No. 1120

Name of Petitioner: Nanjappa, son of Basavarappa, Kayem Gutti of Vudahur

Village: Old Agrahara

Taluk: Mysore

District:

Date of Arzi: 2-11-03

Date of Receipt: 6-11-03

Date of Disposal:

No. of Enclosure: nil

Addressed to H.H. the Maharaja

ABSTRACT

States that his ancestor of toddy revenue of the village has been confirmed in the year of 1890, 1896 & 1902 by the then Dy Comrs after the perusal of all the records in the matter with the petr; that 3 years income was paid as advance to the petr in 1896 as per decision of the Dy Comr in that year to the effect that toddy revenue should be paid to the Kayemgutti from 1892 deducting Gatibhag

Charge at 5 per cent; ~~that~~ on presenting application regarding payment of balance of amount, ~~the~~ late Dewan was pleased to say personally that orders would be issued on the subject; ~~that~~ meanwhile ~~the~~ petitioner's father died; ~~that~~ it has again been ordered in P. No. 2074 of 2-4-901 ~~that to-day~~ affair should soon be settled

Prays for order to pay the amount due from ~~the~~ date of introduction of Amani system deducting ~~the~~ amount advanced & for grant endorsement

Till
13/11/05

No 544
4712-01 (27
dy 20/4/03
To Ulleere Comr
in Mysore

Hon no. 457/239 dy
7/4 relating to the
record of enquiry
relating to the toddy
revenue of the Kayam
gutha Udaboor
village Mysore Tk

In returning the
enclosures recd with
the above for perusal
a respectable person has
the honor to observe
that inter letters dy
20/11/02 & 7/1/03 the
inmates states that
there exists a grove
as well as a shop
in the above village
~~while no grove~~
~~is paid to exist in the~~ in his letter dy 15/4/03

which admits be ~~[illegible]~~ in his state
ment by 15/4/03 the hon
evidence of a stone
which he ascertained
which then is stone
really existing or not
as the fact reported to
Govt. It is requested,
that copies of the samed
& the ~~title~~ mam settlement
record, and the mulka
likes refer to in the
[illegible] of mr B.R
Venkatawardenjan
may be sent to Govt.
A copy of the Betty account
for the year in which the
village was alienated
should also be
obtained & sent

B. R.

for Secy

[illegible]
18/4/03

18/4/03

Office Draft (Docket.)

Mysore Government,
General & Revenue Secretariat.

(4)

To
The Resident Commr
in Mysore

Date of passing the draft
Date of despatch 26/4/03

Regd. No. 428
File No. & date (if any) E.7.12.01

No. of Encls. 1 Petn

P
30/11/03

In continuation
of this office docket no
5744 – E.7.12.01 of 20/4/03,
calling for addl. inform.
in the matter of the Chandan
Claim to the toddy re-
venue of the Kayam-
gutta Udaloor village
Mysore Taluk, has
the honor to ~~forward~~ invite attention
~~herewith~~ the accompanying petn. & pedn
no $\frac{1120}{E.243}$ of $\frac{2nd}{23rd}$ Nov 03
~~from Nanjappa the~~
~~Kayamgutteolan~~ the Chandan,
addressed to H H the
Maharaja & to
request that the

to be obliged if returned

proceed connected
with the claim may
be sued at an early
date ~~for the order~~ with
~~of Court, furnishing~~
~~at the same time~~
the add information ~~as~~
~~already~~ called for

Bll

25/11

Forward

Tsu
25.11.03

SR

SL(5) Soh 52 1902-2

No. 4342 / Ple + 2 OFFICE OF THE EXCISE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

DATED BANGALORE, 31st May 1907

1-6-07

From

P.N. Purnaiya Esquire, B.A.

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

K.S. Chandrasekhara Iyar Esquire, B.A., B.L.

Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending with your docket No.428/Ex.F.12-01, dated 26th November 1903, regarding the claim of the Inamdar of Kayamgutha Udabur in Mysore Taluk to the Toddy Excise revenue of the village, I have the honor to submit herewith copies of the marginally noted further communications from the Deputy Commissioners, with the enclosures thereto filed with the enclosed records of the case.

No 228 dated 1st Decr 1906 and no. 89 dated 9th August 1906

2. As regards the discre[redacted]y pointed out in the matter of the existence of a grove in the village, it will be seen from the records now submitted how both the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Mysore Division and the Excise Divisional officer, have, after personal inspection reported that the village has date groves, and how the previous finding as to the non-existence of a grove is a mistake having been based on the statement of one Nanjappa (the previous Inamdar) who having alienated the village had not visited it for a long time, and Nanjappa himself has admitted his mistake in this respect

3. Authenticated copies of the Nirup of the 1st February 1830 (9th Magha Sudha of the year Virodhi) under which the village was granted on Kayamgutha tenure, and of the

4/2/1830

Mutchilikas

Mutchilikas referred to in the finding of the Deputy Commissioner (the late Mr.B.K.Venkatavaradaiengar) will be found filed in the records. I have also enclosed for reference a copy of the Inam Settlement Register since obtained from the Superintendent of Inam Settlement.

4. Lastly in regard to the Beriz account for the year of alienation, called for by Government, I beg to state that no account of the particular year in question has been produced. The Deputy Commissioner has, however, submitted the Kulvar Chitta for the year Sarvajit (1827-28) produced by the present holder of the village and in doing so observes that therefore "it may be seen that the toddy revenue had merged in the Beriz of the village even before alienation".

5. Perusing the Nirup of 1830 it will be noticed that the beriz of the village for purposes of the Kayamgutha grant has been determined with reference to the Huttuvali of the five years preceding; and according to the Chitta for 1827-28 the beriz includes an item of 3 Varahas under Ichalpairu a term, which having been among other items of miscellaneous taxes (ಇಚಲ್ಪೈರು ತರಿಗೆ) detailed in the Chitta, may be construed to have been used to mean distinctly the Excise revenue from toddy, in consonance with a similar finding accepted by Government in Proceedings No.332-4/Ex.F.12-01, dated 16th February 1903 with reference to the rights of the Sivasamudram Jahagir.

6. On a further consideration of the question in the additional light thrown by the Chitta, of 1827-28 since produced by the Inamdar, which gives the details of the beriz alienated by the Nirup of 1830, and also in view of the fact that the Nirup has not reserved any rights, I am inclined to reconsider my opinion contained in my letter to Government No.4571/239, dated 7th February 1903, and to say that according to the grant the Inamdar has been conceded the Excise revenue from toddy.

7. As regards actual enjoyment of the revenue by the Inamdar, uninterrupted documentary evidence dating from 1868 has

been

been adduced; and a presumption of enjoyment during the previous years may be justified by the recorded entries in the original Chitta of 1845 received with the Chitta of 1827 28, and the Nirup of 1830; and even the adverse finding at the Inam settlement has not interrupted such enjoyment.

8. In these circumstances I beg leave to support the Deputy Commissioner's finding conceding the Excise Revenue from Toddy to the Inamdar.

9. The village has both a shop and a grove and the case therefore falls under paras 2, 5 and 9 of the Rules of the 2nd August 1901.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.



Excise Commissioner

in Mysore.

B.R.

FROM

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Inam Commissioner
in Mysore

Dated 1st December 1906

Despatched

Received

General No. 220
No.

Enclosure No. 16.

His docket no 1305 dated 26th September 1906 calling for certain additional information regarding the claim of the Inamdar of Kayamgutta Udbur Village, Mysore Taluq, to the Jodi revenue of that Village

—— o ——

In reply to the above has the honor to submit herewith the "Kulvar Chitta of the Village for the year "Sarvajitu" 1827-28 produced by Mr V. Raghavachar

Mr. V. Raghavachar, advocate from which it may be seen that the Loddy revenue had merged in the Berij of the Village even before alienation

(Sd) T. K. Sundara Iyengar
for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Copy
A. R.
for Chief Commissioner
Mysore

G.R.S. 28]

File No. 52-02

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 5259 8 80

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(SDR)

the 190

Date of issue 11 June/08

Signed by M Balasubbaiah

READ.— The following letters from the Resc Commr in Mysore relating to the claim to the Todi revenue of Hadabor Rayamguttia village Mysore Taluk

1) No 4571-239 of 7.2.1903

2) No 4342 of 31.5.07

(Order passed in 4 lines)

ORDER THEREON.—No.

SUBJECT

Order thereon No 76 6461-3 / S.R 52-02 } 11 June / 8

The Samad doesn't expressly concede the toddy excise revenue and the Inam settlement actually reserves it to Govt. The Excise Comr was in his first letter read above of opinion that the Inamdar was not entitled to the toddy excise revenue

2 On a further consideration of the question of the extent of rights conceded by the Samad to the Inamdar in the light of the additional evidence adduced by him the Excise Comr is of opinion that as according to the "Kulawar Chitta of 1827-28, the

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

berizz of the village includes an item of 3 varahas under "Khal-fäuod" a term which may be in his opinion construed to mean excise revenue from todzz, the Inamdar is entitled to todzz, excise

3. On an examination of the Chitta accounts produced by the Inamdar with reference to the Consolidated account of the whole Taluk for some years before and after 1830 it is found that "todzz" revenue was included in "Raje Rab

and no revenue was shown under this item against "Kaycan Suttra villages" the entry of 3 varahas in the Chitta accounts cannot therefore be ~~a conclusive~~ sufficient evidence of the ~~inclusion~~ alienation of this item of revenue ~~in the lands alienated~~ to the Dwandar.

4. ~~But~~ On the other hand on a consideration of the general documents produced by the Dwandar in support of his claim Good (agreeing with the Inquiry Comte) are of opinion that there

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

has been long continued enjoyment of Coorg revenue though unauthorized and that the case is one deserving of special treatment under rule 20 of G.O. No 2074-83-R+166-92 of 2/8/1901

5. In accordance with the principle underlying the late Chief Comr's Pro. No 3697 Rev. 30 of the 8th Oct 1873 the Coorg sugar revenue will therefore be allowed in full to the

present proprietor 5259-06
of the village and in
one moiety to his successor
in title after whom
it shall lapse to Govt.
6 The village has both
a grove and a shop,
and the payment of
revenue will be regulated
by rules 2, 5 & 9 of
the G.O. of the 2nd August 1907
referred to above

27 Dec 07

Secy

21/12

Secy

To the Excise Commr. for necessary records
The Commr. of Excise
The Subst. of Anaca & Ghuth

Secy
11/12/07

11/12/07

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore Financial (Separate Revenue), dated 11th June 1908.

READ—

The following letters from the Excise Commissioner in Mysore, relating to the claim to the toddy revenue of Udabur Kayamgutta village, Mysore Taluk:—

1. No. 4571-239, dated the 7th February 1903.
2. No. 4342, dated the 31st May 1907.

No. FL. 6461-3—S. R. 52-02, DATED BANGALORE, 11TH JUNE 1908.

ORDER THEREON.—The sannad does not expressly concede the toddy excise revenue and the Inam Settlement actually reserves it to Government. The Excise Commissioner was in his first letter read above of opinion that the Inamdar was not entitled to the toddy excise revenue.

2. On a further consideration of the question of the extent of rights conceded by the sannad to the Inamdar in the light of additional evidence adduced by him, the Excise Commissioner is of opinion that as according to the Kulwar Chitta of 1827-28, the beriz of the village includes an item of three varahas under "Ichalpairu," a term which may in his opinion be construed to mean excise revenue from toddy, the Inamdar is entitled to toddy excise.

3. On an examination of the chitta accounts produced by the Inamdar with reference to the consolidated account of the whole taluk for some years before and after 1830, it is found that toddy revenue was included in "Baje Bab" and no revenue was shown under this item against "Kayamgutta villages." The entry of three varahas in the Chitta accounts cannot therefore be sufficient evidence of the alienation of this item of revenue to the Inamdar.

4. On the other hand on a consideration of the several documents produced by the Inamdar in support of his claim, Government (agreeing with the Excise Commissioner) are of opinion that there has been long continued enjoyment of toddy revenue though unauthorizedly and that the case is one deserving of special treatment under Rule 20 of Government Order No. 2074-83—R. F. 166-92, dated the 2nd August 1901.

5. In accordance with the principle underlying the late Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 3697—Rev. 30, dated the 8th October 1873, the toddy excise revenue will therefore be allowed in full to the present proprietor of the village and in one moiety to his successor in title after whom it shall lapse to Government.

6. The village has both a grove and a shop and the payment of revenue will be regulated by Rules 2, 5 and 9 of the Government Order of the 2nd August 1901 referred to above.

C. S. BALASUNDARAM IYER,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore returning the records.
The Comptoller, Mysore Government.
The Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

Exd.—C. P. S.